

in the Pentateuch "the great river" (*κατ' ἑξοχην*), which it would not have been had the much larger river, the Nile of Egypt, been known to the Israelites; and secondly, we find it stated in the account of the first of the "plagues of Mitzraim" that "the Eternal spake unto Moses, Say unto Aaron, Take thy rod, and stretch out thine hand upon the waters of Mitzraim, upon their streams (*naharothám*), upon their river (*yeorehém*), and upon their ponds (*agmehém*), and upon all their pools (*mikveh memehém*) of water, that they may become blood;"¹ when, if the words "naharóth," "yeorím," "agammím," and "mikveh mayim," be considered (which it would seem they ought to be) as placed in the order of their relative importance, it would result that the "yeór" must be looked upon as being of an inferior character to the "nahár;" and seeing that "nahár" is from its derivation a *stream* or natural river of flowing water—from *nahár*, "to flow"—it is not unlikely that "yeór" may, in contradiction to "nahár," mean an artificial watercourse, a *canal*, as apparently it does in Job xxviii. 10. Or it may mean a *fountain*, or perhaps even a 'wády or "winter-brook." At all events, as there were several

¹ Exod. vii. 19.

yeórs (yeorím) in Mitzraim and elsewhere, and the expression *yeór* is subordinate to *nahar*;^{*}—the “bahr” of the Arabs, the “yeór” of Exodus, cannot under any circumstances be their Bahr en Nil—the river Nile, which, in the estimation of the natives of Egypt, both ancient and modern, is without its equal in the whole world.

On an impartial consideration of the whole subject, it appears to be certain that the country in which the *yeór* of Mitzraim¹ was situated was altogether beyond the reach of the Nilotic inundations, not merely on account of its total unfitness for the permanent pasture of the flocks and herds of the Israelites, had it been subject to be periodically overflowed, but also from the circumstance that had it been exposed to these inundations, the description given of it in the Pentateuch, and the marked distinction made between Mitzraim and the Land of Canaan, would be totally inapplicable. The words are, “For the land, whither thou goest in to possess it, is not as the land of Mitzraim, from whence ye came out, *where thou sowedst thy seed, and wateredst it with thy foot, as a garden of herbs*: but the land, whither ye go to possess it, is a land of hills and valleys, and drinketh water of the rain of heaven: a land which the Eternal thy God careth for;”²—

¹ See Origines Biblicæ, pp. 288, 289.

² Deut. xi. 10-12.

from which declaration it is manifest that the grand distinction between the Promised Land and the country of Mitzraim, as regarded the productions of Nature, was, that in the former country vegetation was produced by natural means, that is to say, by "the rain from heaven," whereas in the latter it was principally by artificial irrigation,—by the 'watering with the foot'—that the abundant harvests were produced which caused Mitzraim to be a place of refuge for the pastoral people of the regions to the north-east, in the time of scarcity to which they were so often subject from a deficiency of water in their own country.

The discussion of the subject of the *Yam Suf*, or Red Sea, which I consider to be the Sea of Edom, or Gulf of Akaba, and not the Gulf of Suez,¹ had better be deferred till I come to treat of my voyage up that sea in the steamer "Erin," so kindly placed at my disposal for that purpose by his Highness the Khédive of Egypt.

The way being otherwise thus cleared, we may proceed to the consideration of the true position of Mount Sinai.

From what has been said in the preceding

¹ See *Origines Biblicæ*, pp. 176–182; also Dr. Beke's "Mount Sinai a Volcano," p. 8, published 1873.

chapter, it is manifest that there is no tradition respecting the position of Mount Sinai on which the slightest dependence can be placed, unless indeed the statements of the Apostle Paul and the historian Josephus, already cited, be accepted as indications of the survival to their days of the knowledge that that mountain was situated within the Arabian country of Midian on the east side of the valley of the Jordan, and its continuation to the Gulf of Akaba, known as the Ghor and Wády Arabah; and that the Biblical Land of Midian was part of the "East Country" inhabited by the descendants of the Patriarch Abraham by Keturah¹—that is to say, the country lying to the east of Jordan—is a truism that scarcely stands in need of proof. The position of Midian is thus stated in "*Origines Biblicæ*:"²—"It is known that the district immediately to the eastward of the Dead Sea and of the Jordan was possessed by the Moabites and Ammonites, the descendants of Lot; and as the situation of the country of the Keturites was also east of Jordan, these latter people, of whom the Midianites were a principal branch, must—so far as they spread themselves southward,—necessarily have had their territory at the front, or to the east

¹ Gen. xxv. 1-5.

² *Origines Biblicæ*, p. 190.

of the country of the children of Moab and Ammon. In this extending themselves over the great Syrian Desert, as far, probably, as 'the great river, the river Euphrates,' the possessions of these descendants of Abraham by Keturah would have approached those of the children of Ishmael, who 'dwelt from Havilah unto Shur, that is before Mitzraim, as thou goest toward Assyria ;'¹ and as these two people were of common origin, we can have no difficulty in conceiving that the Midianites may have become so intermixed and even amalgamated with the Ishmaelites, as to have occasioned the two races frequently to be considered as one people. That such was actually the case is, indeed, evident from the fact, that the names of these two people, the Ishmaelites and the Midianites, are in two instances used in Scripture as convertible terms; the one instance being where the 'company of Ishmeelites,' to whom Joseph was sold by his brethren, are in the same passage also described as 'Midianites,' 'merchant-men ;'² and the other occurring where the Midianites, under Zebah and Zalmunna, who were conquered by Gideon, are mentioned as wearing 'golden ear-rings,' because they were Ishmaelites,³ that is to say, Midianites."

¹ Gen. xxv. 18.² Gen. xxxvii. 25-28.³ Judges viii. 12-24.

[In support of this hypothesis, I would venture to draw attention to our friend, Captain Richard Burton's recent discoveries in Midian. I think I may evidence, as a remarkable confirmation of Dr. Beke's conclusion, the *fact* that Captain Burton has found gold there. Following in the footsteps of my lamented husband, he made an expedition at the commencement of last year (1877) to the Land of Midian, on the east side of the Gulf of Akaba (which is under the viceregal rule of the Khédive of Egypt); that he landed at Moilah, on the east coast of the Arabian Gulf (erroneously called "Red Sea"), at the entrance to the Gulf of Akaba, or "Red Sea;" that thence he proceeded to Aiuunah, a place a little farther north—of which a description is given by Dr. Beke in chapter vii.; and here commenced those explorations which resulted in the following announcement in the "Times" of the 14th May 1877:—"From Makna, *i.e.*, Midian (Mugna of the maps), the capital of the Land of Midian,¹ up to Akaba, at the head of the gulf, Captain Burton reports the country as auriferous, and he believes the district southwards as far as Gebel Hassani—a mountain well known to geographers—to possess the same character. He even goes so far as to say

¹ For illustration of Midian, see chapter vii.

he has brought back to life an ancient California." It is further reported by Captain Burton that the country abounds in curious wádies ; that the coast is divided from the interior by a range of granite and porphyry mountains running about parallel with the sea ; but water has worn its way as usual, and these gorges, each with its mountain torrent, occur at frequent intervals. They are barren rocky places, with no possibility of much culture, *and yet they all bear signs of abundant population in times gone by.* Large towns, built *not* of mud, as Arab towns often are, but of solid masonry, such as the Romans always used ; roads cut in the rock, aqueducts five miles long, remains of massive fortresses, artificial lakes—all signs of wealth. That the rocks are full of mineral wealth. Gold and silver he found in great quantities—the quartz and chlorites occurring with gold in them just as they are found in the gold districts of South America ; evidences of turquoise mines ; and abundance of copper, antimony, and, indeed, of all the metals mentioned in the Books of Numbers and in Judges. Thus affording a most remarkable confirmation of the truth of the Holy Record, that, " among the spoils brought from the Land of Midian (Numb. xxxi. 22, 50-54) were gold, silver, brass, tin, iron, lead, and jewels ; " and in

another expedition (Judges viii. 24-27) that the quantity of gold taken was so great that "Gideon made an ephod thereof, and put it in his city." It is a curious fact (says a correspondent of the "Times," 12th November 1877) that these mines were known to the ancients so long ago as the time of Ramses III., whose cartouche is inscribed on the Needle which has just been brought to England. In the Harris Papyrus, in the British Museum, the following passage occurs (and is given from the translation of the hieroglyphics):—"I, Ramses, have sent my commissioners to the land Akaba, to the great mines of coppers and others there, and their ships were loaded with coppers and others (the men) marching on their asses. Nobody had heard since the olden kings that one had found these mines. The cargoes were copper. The cargoes were by myriads; for their ships which went from there to Egypt arrived happily. Discharge was made according to order under the pavilion of brick of the Kings of Thebes of the copper, numerous as frogs in the marsh, in quality equal to gold of the third degree, admired by the world as a marvellous thing."

From what has been so far related, it may without doubt be concluded that the Midian, which Dr. Beke discovered in 1874 on the east side of the

Gulf of Akaba, is the Midian of Moses's father-in-law, Jethro, the priest of Midian, Dr. Beke having identified "Moses's Place of Prayer" at Midian (Mugua of the maps) with the "Encampment by the Red Sea of the Israelites," and Marghara Sho'eib, or "Jethro's Cave" (distant half a day's journey), also with the "Elim" of the Exodus.

Apart then from the interest generally felt in Captain Burton's explorations now being made in search of gold, those who are interested in the far more momentous Biblical subject, will look, as I do, with the deepest anxiety for the particulars which this learned and experienced traveller can so ably, and indeed better than any one else, furnish us with, of this hitherto little known and unexplored country.¹—ED.]

The convertibility of the two terms "Midianites" and "Ishmaelites" is similar to that at the present day of Britons and Englishmen,—Gauls and Frenchmen. The Ishmaelites, however, would appear to have stretched themselves out farther to the south and east than the Midianites, namely, towards Havilah, which in Genesis x. 28, 29, is joined with Sheba and Ophir, these three countries having been all noted for the gold which they

¹ See Capt. Burton's forthcoming work, "The Gold Mines of Midian."

supplied; and hence it was that the Ishmaelites obtained the "golden earrings" which they were accustomed to wear.¹

Some curious information bearing immediately on this subject was communicated by the Rev. George Williams to the Section of Geography and Ethnology, at the Cambridge Meeting of the British Association, on October 7, 1862, and recorded by me in "A Few Words with Bishop Colenso;"² on the subject of the Exodus of the Israelites and the position of Mount Sinai, published shortly afterwards. It was to the effect, that there is a tribe of Arabs inhabiting a portion of the Arabian Desert, east of the Ghor—that is to say, in the direction of the ancient land of Midian—who are described as being much superior to the ordinary Bedouins, and in several respects very different from them.³ They profess the Israelitish religion, and declare themselves to be Ishmaelites descended from the Rechabites, "the children of the Kenite, Moses's father-in-law,"⁴ affirming that they dwelt in the original country of their forefathers. A

¹ The position of Ophir is discussed in "Origines Biblicæ," pp. 112-116, and in "The Sources of the Nile," pp. 60-65.

² Published by Williams & Norgate, 1862, p. 11.

³ Did not Captain Burton meet with them on his journey to Mecca?

⁴ Judges i. 16, iv. 11.

peculiarity of this relation, which was at that time, as it is now, my motive for directing attention to it, is, that these Bedouins are said to claim to be both Ishmaelites and Rechabites (that is, "Midianites"), the two descents being adopted by them apparently without any distinction; in which fact we have a pertinent illustration of the two texts of Scripture adverted to above.

The situation of the country of the Midianites being thus approximatively determined, even if not absolutely defined, if we now turn to the second chapter of Exodus, we there read that, "Moses fled from the face of Pharaoh, and dwelt in the land of Midian,"¹ that is to say, in this "East Country," the only country that ever rightly bore that name. The placing of the Midian into which Moses fled within the mountainous region on the *west* side of the Gulf of Akaba, where it is actually to the south of the Négeb, or "South Country,"² and thus making it appear that there were at one and the same time two countries of one and the same name on the two opposite sides of the Gulf of Akaba, or Red Sea, is one of the absurdities which have been caused by the exigencies of the Egyptian tradition, which had placed Mount

¹ Exod. ii. 15.

² Gen. xx. 1.

Sinai within the Peninsula on the west side of that Gulf.

We further read that whilst dwelling in this land of Midian in the "East Country," "Moses kept the flock of Jethro, his father-in-law, the priest of Midian; and he led the flock to the back side of the desert,"¹—as the expression is usually rendered; but, as it should be translated in its proper geographical sense,² "to the *west* of the desert,"—and he there "came to the Mount of God, Horeb," which mountain, consequently, as regards the direction from the dwelling of Jethro in Midian, whence Moses had led the sheep, would be on that side of the desert which is nearest to Mitzraim, or between his country and Midian.

After the command given to Moses to return to Mitzraim, he first "went and returned to Jethro, his father-in-law,"³ in Midian, to acquaint him with his intended departure, and then he "took his wife and his sons, and set them upon an ass, and he returned to the land of Mitzraim."⁴ And we further read that the Eternal, agreeably to the

¹ Exod. iii. 1.

² The Hebrews express "east," "west," "north," and "south," by "before," "behind," "left," and "right" according to their bearing from the position of a man whose face is turned towards the rising sun.

³ Exod. iv. 18.

⁴ Exod. iv. 20.

word which He spake to Moses at Horeb, said to Aaron, "Go into the wilderness to meet Moses. And he went, and met him in the Mount of God."¹ The fact here undeniably established is that Moses, on his road from Midian into Mitzraim, encountered Aaron, who was coming out of the latter country to meet him, and that the place where the brothers met was "the Mount of God," the identical place "to the west side of the desert," where the Eternal had previously appeared to Moses "in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush."²

In the absence of all reasons to the contrary, we are justified, therefore, in assuming—if indeed we are not bound to conclude—that the road which was taken by Moses on his return to Mitzraim, and on which he was thus met by Aaron, was the usual and direct road between the two countries; for on no other road would they have had a chance of encountering one another without a special direction from the Almighty as to the course they were each to take; and that no such direction was given is to be inferred from the words of God unto Moses, having been, simply, "*Is not Aaron the Levite thy brother? . . . Behold, he cometh forth to meet thee.*"³ Consequently it is in the direction

¹ Exod. iv. 27.² Exod. iii. 2.³ Exod. iv. 14.

of this highroad between Mitzraim and Midian that we have to look for the precise position of "the Mount of God."

It may be well here to touch briefly on the question as to whether "Horeb, the Mount of God," is the same as "Mount Sinai" on which the Law was delivered—not that any real difficulty on this point presents itself to my own mind, but because of the idea entertained by many persons that the two must be different, inasmuch as the monkish tradition, which makes Jebel Musa to be Sinai, regards as Horeb the rock projecting into the plain of Rahab, known as Ras Sufsâfeh. But the utter worthlessness of the tradition having been shown, any argument based on that tradition alone cannot but be equally valueless. As far as the Scripture narrative is concerned, Sinai and Horeb appear to be synonymous and interchangeable designations of the same Holy Place. In the words of Jerome, "*Mihi autem videtur quod duplici nomine mons nunc Sina, nunc Choreb vocetur.*"¹

The country to the east of the meridian of the Jordan and of the Gulf of Akaba, in which Mount Sinai is thus shown to be situated, is so little known, that any attempt to fix with precision the position

¹ *De Situ et Nominibus*, 191.

of the spot where the Almighty spake with His servant Moses in the sight of the Children of Israel, must, without precise local information, be hardly better than mere speculation.

For forty years past, since I published "*Origines Biblicæ*," I have from time to time speculated on the subject in various publications, of which the principal ones are noted at foot; the last of them, namely, the pamphlet "*Mount Sinai a Volcano*,"¹ having been the immediate cause of the journey which I undertook towards the close of last year (1873), with a view to verify the conclusions at which I had arrived in that pamphlet. What success has attended my attempt will be narrated in chapters vii. and viii.

¹ "*Mount Sinai a Volcano*," published by Tinsley Brothers, 1873. "*A Few Words with Bishop Colenso*," published by Williams & Norgate, 1862. "*On the Localities of Horeb, Mount Sinai, and Midian*," published in the "*British Magazine*," vol. vii., June 1835. "*On the Wanderings of the Israelites in the Desert*," "*Asiatic Journal*," May 1838. "*On the Passage of the Red Sea by the Israelites*," "*Asiatic Journal*," vol. xxvi., May 1838. "*The Idol in Horeb*," Tinsley Brothers, 1871. Mrs. Beke's "*Jacob's Flight*," Longmans & Co., 1865, &c.

CHAPTER III.*

THE DYNASTIES OF MANETHO, AND ESPECIALLY THOSE OF THE
SHEPHERD KINGS, OR MITZRITES.

It is said that about the middle of the third century before the commencement of the Christian era, Manetho, the High Priest of the Temple of Isis at Sebennytris, in Lower Egypt, was commanded by Ptolemy Philadelphus, the second sovereign of the Greek Dynasty of the Lagidæ, to compose in the Greek language a history of his native country from the sacred records.

The Egyptian scribe is represented as being versed in Greek not less than in Egyptian lore, which might well be the case, seeing the intercourse that had existed between Greece and Egypt during the four centuries which had elapsed since the accession of Psammitichus in 665 B.C. As instances of this, and also to serve as landmarks of the interchange of ideas that must necessarily have taken place between the two nations during that long interval, it may be mentioned that Solon visited Egypt in

* Written by the late Dr. Beke, June 12, 1874.

558 B.C., Thales in 548 B.C., Hecatæus in 520-475 B.C., Pythagoras in 498, and Herodotus in 413 B.C.

It has long been the habit to attribute to the Egyptians an amount of wisdom far exceeding that of any other nations of antiquity, in support of which notion is also the statement in 1 Kings iv. 30, that "Solomon's wisdom excelled the wisdom of all the children of the east country, and all the wisdom of Mitzraim;" but this, in the first place, is founded on the assumption that "Mitzraim" means "Egypt," which I deny; and secondly, this wisdom of one man is placed in juxtaposition with the "wisdom of the children of the east country," and with that of the learned men named in the following verse.¹ "For he was wiser than all men; than Ethan the Ezrahite, and Heman, and Chalcol, and Darda, the sons of Mahol: and his fame was in all nations round about;" so that in reality it has no specific application. That an inquisitive traveller like Herodotus should call the Egyptians "by far the best-instructed people with whom he had become acquainted, since they, of all men, store up most for recollection,"² is just such a remark as an European traveller of the present day might make with respect to the Hindoos or Chinese.

¹ 1 Kings iv. 31.

² Herodotus, lib. ii. sect. 77.

And on the other hand, we may well imagine a native of the Celestial Empire to address an "outside barbarian" in words similar to those in which, as Plato tells us, the priests of Sais apostrophised one of the seven sages of Greece: "O Solon, Solon! you Greeks are but children; in Greece there does not exist an old man." I may even appeal to my own experience in Abyssinia, where the longer I resided, and the more I became acquainted with the language, and the manners, and customs of the people, the more learned and intelligent I was considered to be; so that had I remained long enough among those semi-barbarians, I might eventually have expected to be complimented on my having become as wise as themselves.

And yet, notwithstanding this self-conceit, the sure sign of real ignorance, we may rest assured that, like as the Europeans in India, China, and Abyssinia, the Greeks imported into Egypt far more real knowledge than they acquired from the natives of that country.

Without raising any question as to the authenticity of the story of Manetho, which is, however, similar to the apocryphal tale of the origin of the Greek version of the Old Testament, said to have been in like manner made by order of Ptolemy

Philadelphus, by seventy-two learned Jews of Alexandria, it has to be remarked that lists of the Sovereigns of Egypt must have existed long before the time of the Ptolemies. Herodotus, who visited that country more than a century and a half before the date attributed to Manetho, relates that :—
“When the part cut off had been made firm land by this Menes, who was *first king*, he in the first place built on it the city that is now called Memphis. . . . In the next place, *they relate* that he built in it the Temple of Vulcan. . . . After this the priests enumerated from a book the names of three hundred and thirty other kings. In so many generations of men, there were eighteen Ethiopians and one native queen, the rest were Egyptians.”¹
And he goes on to say :² “Thus much of the account the Egyptians and the priests related, showing that from the first king to this priest of Vulcan who last reigned, were three hundred forty and one generations of men ; and during these generations, there were the same number of chief priests and kings. Now, three hundred generations are equal to ten thousand years, for three generations of men are one hundred years : and the forty-one remaining generations that were over the

¹ Cary's Translation of Herodotus, Euterpe, 99, 100.

² Ibid., 142, 143.

three hundred, make one thousand three hundred and forty years . . . In former time, the priests of Jupiter did to Hecatæus the historian, when he was tracing his own genealogy, and connecting his family with a god in the sixteenth degree, the same as they did to me, though I did not trace my genealogy. Conducting me into the interior of an edifice that was spacious, and showing me wooden colossuses to the number I have mentioned, they reckoned them up; for every high priest places an image of himself there during his lifetime; the priests, therefore, reckoning them and showing them to me, pointed out that each was the son of his own father; going through them all, from the image of him that died last; until they had pointed them all out."

Though Josephus tells us that Manetho "finds great fault with Herodotus for his ignorance and false relations of Egyptian affairs,"¹ which, with the faith I have in the truthfulness of the Halicarnasian traveller, and the little reliance I have on the statements of the "veracious" Jewish historian, and the Egyptian annalist, I am inclined to accept as a testimonial in favour of Herodotus.

This alleged work of Manetho has not come down to our days: it did not even exist in the time of the Jewish historian Josephus, but is conjectured

¹ *Contra Apion*, lib. i. c. 14.

to have perished when the great Alexandrian Library, founded by the same Ptolemy, was destroyed by fire, "in the forty-seventh year before Christ." But fragments of it have been preserved by Josephus and others, and lists of the Sovereigns of Egypt from the time of Menes, said to be copied from Manetho, and probably obtained from other sources, likewise are found in the writings of subsequent authors, of whom the most famous are Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea, in the fourth century of our era, and the Byzantine monk, Georgius Syncellus, who lived five centuries later, and from whose work we possess the fullest list of the various dynasties of the sovereigns of Egypt according to Manetho, which he professes to have taken from the works of Julius Apecarius, Bishop of Emmæus or Nicopolis, in Judæa, who flourished in the beginning of the third century, A.D. 250, or nearly five centuries after Manetho himself.

Whatever questions may have existed formerly as to the genuineness of these Manetho dynasties, or as to whether some of them at least ought not to be considered as contemporaneous, like those of the kings of our Saxon Heptarchy, these Manethonic dynasties are at the present day accepted by most Egyptologists as authentic lists of one consecutive series of Sovereigns, who governed that coun-

try from the remotest period of history ; the date of the accession of the earliest king, Menes, being placed by Bunsen in 3059 B.C., by Lepsius in 3893 B.C., and by Mariette in 5005 B.C. ; and the authenticity of these lists, notwithstanding these manifest discrepancies respecting their commencement, is affirmed to be established by the testimony of the hieroglyphical inscriptions on the monumental remains of Egypt, as deciphered according to the system of Champollion.

Nevertheless, it is a singular fact, which does not appear to have received the attention that it so justly deserves, that those hieroglyphical inscriptions, as hitherto interpreted, are far from agreeing with, and so confirming, the Manethonic lists. This is what Mariette Bey himself says on the subject in his valuable little work, "*Aperçu de l'Histoire d'Égypte*,"¹ published in 1872: from which I think it right to make the following extract. Speaking of the principal monuments possessing a general historic interest, that learned Egyptologist candidly states that they are as follows :—

"The first is a papyrus preserved in the Turin Museum, to which it was sold by M. Drovetti, Consul-Général for France. Were this papyrus in-

¹ Alexandria, Mourès & Co., 3d edit., 1872, p. 126.

tact, Egyptology would not possess a more precious monument; for it contains a list of all the mythical and historical personages who have reigned over Egypt from the fabulous ages down to a period which we cannot estimate because we do not possess the latter portion of the papyrus. This list, which was composed during the reign of Ramses II., one of the best epochs of Egyptian history, has all the signs of an official document; and it would be of the greatest assistance to us, inasmuch as each royal name is followed by the length of his reign, and at the end of each dynasty is inserted the total number of years during which that dynasty had governed the affairs of Egypt. Unfortunately the carelessness of 'the fellahs who discovered the *'Royal Papyrus of Turin,'* and the still greater carelessness of those who forwarded it to Europe, have dealt it the most fatal blow, and this inestimable treasure, from its having thus passed through unskilful hands, now only exists in minute fragments (164 in number), which for the most part it is impossible to put together. Incomparable in value as it would be were it entire, the Turin papyrus has thus lost all credit, and it is seldom referred to in works treating of Egyptology.

"2. Another precious monument was removed

from the Temple of Karnak by M. Prisse and presented to the Imperial Library of Paris. This monument consists of a small chamber, on the walls of which is represented Thūtmis III. making offerings before the images of sixty-one of his predecessors; whence it is called the 'Hall of the Ancestors' (Salle des Ancêtres). But here we have not to do with a regular uninterrupted series; the monarch has made a *choice* from among his predecessors, and to them alone he pays homage. But what is the reason for this choice? At first sight, then, the Hall of the Ancestors can only be regarded as an extract from the royal lists of Egypt. The person who has composed this list, from motives which we cannot fathom, has taken here and there some names of kings, sometimes accepting an entire dynasty, at other times altogether passing over long periods. It has further to be remarked that the artist to whom was confided the embellishment of the chamber has executed his work from an artistic point of view, without caring to place his figures in strictly chronological order. And in the last place, it must be mentioned that some lamentable mutilations—twelve names of kings are wanting—have partially deprived the Paris list of its importance. Hence it results that

the Hall of the Ancestors does not afford to science all the assistance we had seemingly a right to expect from it. It has however rendered us the service of determining more precisely than any other list the names borne by the kings of the thirteenth dynasty.

“3. The Monument called the Table of Abydos has to be added to the series we are now enumerating. As is indicated by its name, this monument comes from Abydos, whence it was taken by M. Mimaut, Consul-General of France, and it is now among the treasures preserved in the British Museum.

“In the whole archæology of Egypt there is perhaps no monument more celebrated and yet so little deserving its reputation. It is here, Ramses II. who is paying homage to his ancestors. Originally the royal *cartouches* (not including those of the dedicator himself which are repeated twenty-eight times), were fifty in number, of which there only remain thirty, more or less complete. Then, the Table of Abydos, like the Hall of the Ancestors, offers us a list which is the result of a choice inspired by motives unknown to us. There is also another cause which detracts from the scientific value which the Table of Abydos might otherwise possess : we have not its commencement. After the eight-

eenth dynasty, this list passes without transition to the twelfth ; but to what dynasty are we to attach the fourteen unknown cartouches which the monument places above the twelfth ? Do they belong to the most ancient royal families, or are they to be used for filling up a portion of the monumental break (*vide*) which we find between the sixth and the eleventh ? Consequently the Table of Abydos is not one of those authorities, such as the Papyrus of Turin might have been, which serve to lay a solid foundation-stone for science. No doubt when Egyptology was in its infancy it aided Champollion in his classification of the kings of the eighteenth dynasty. Later on it served Lepsius as a *repère* to place the Amenemhas and Ousertasens in their respective orders, and thus to identify these Monarchs of Manetho's twelfth dynasty. But that is all, and it is not likely that the Table of Abydos will ever reveal to us any more of those secrets which so powerfully aid our studies." And in a footnote the learned author adds : "There exist at Abydos two temples raised to the local divinity, the first by Seti, and the other by Ramses. One and the same series of kings, twice repeated without any change, adorned these two temples. The one is the 'Table of Abydos' of which I have just

spoken : the other has recently been discovered by ourselves. This second table, which is the prototype of the one in London, although in excellent preservation, adds very little to our knowledge. It makes known to us some new names of kings ; it confirms the dynastic classification of some others ; but it is still far from giving us a regular and consecutive series of all the Kings who have reigned over Egypt from Menes down to Seti."

"4. The most complete and most interesting monument of this kind that we possess is the one resulting from our excavations at Saqqarah which now forms part of the Boulak Collection. This has not a royal origin as the others have. It was discovered in the tomb of an Egyptian priest, named *Tūnar-i*, who lived in the time of Ramses II. It was a point of Egyptian belief that one of the privileges reserved for the dead who had merited eternal life was to be admitted to the society of the kings. *Tūnar-i* is here represented as entering into the august assembly, in which fifty-eight kings are present. But all the doubts raised by the Table of Abydos are revived here. Why these fifty-eight kings more than any others ? As long as this problem remains unsolved, the Table of Saqqarah can only possess a relative value for science. It

must, however, be said that the list in the Boulak Museum has incontestable advantages over all the others. In the first place we know its commencement, and thus we possess a fixed *jalon* at the head of the list: secondly, between the *jalon* and the termination of the series, may be added here and there, by means of cartouches previously known and classified, certain other intermediate *jalons*, which give to the grand outlines of the whole a precision unknown to the other documents. By this means it is that, beyond the eighteenth, the twelfth, and the eleventh dynasties, we reach the six earliest dynasties, which, by an unlooked-for good fortune, we find on this Table almost as complete as they are in Manetho. The Table of Saqqarah is therefore, at all events, an exceptional monument, to which we shall presently direct all our attention."

"Such," says the learned Egyptologist, "are the most celebrated Egyptian monuments which possess a general interest for history;" and these monuments, as it is manifest from his candid avowal, do not agree with the Manethonic dynastic lists. Why then are we to accept those chronicles of the Ptolemaic era, which have come down to us through such doubtful channels, in preference to

the contemporaneous records of a "Ramses II.," a "Thūtmis III.," and of a "Tūnar-i living under Ramses II." ?

M. Mariette adduces the lists on these monuments as proofs of the truth of the Manethonic lists. "The Table of Saqqarah," says he, "fortunately comes to lend its support to the Egyptian annalist. That table being only able to give us *a choice* of sovereigns, we must not expect to find in it all the names that Manetho enumerates." Ought it not rather to be said that the simple fact of our not finding in it all the names that Manetho enumerates, affords a convincing proof that the Manethonic dynastic lists, whatever may be their real value, are no true chronological lists of the Sovereigns of Egypt ?

For myself, I am assuredly disposed to give far more credence to the monuments of those early periods themselves than to the statements of the scribe of Sebennytris, whose writings, penned one thousand years after the assumed date of those monuments, have themselves only been handed down to us by a Byzantine monk who lived another thousand years after Manetho himself.

My object in thus adverting to the general subject of the history of Ancient Egypt, in which I

should not otherwise have any special interest, is to show how little dependence is to be placed on the views generally entertained respecting the absolute character of that history and its chronology as opposed to those of the Hebrew Scriptures, and that the date of 5005 B.C., of 3893 B.C., or even of 3059 B.C., for the commencement of the reign of Menes, the founder of the Egyptian Monarchy, ought by no means to be taken as irrevocably established.

The monuments of the country themselves must always perform a highly important part in the reconstruction of its history. Those of the so-called Hyksos or Shepherd Kings, discovered by M. Mariette, have already thrown an intense light on that portion of it which is contemporaneous with the history of the Hebrew Pentateuch. The opinion advanced by me in my "*Origines Biblicæ*" forty years ago, that the Mitzraim of Scripture is not the Egypt of Profane History, is now shown to be substantially true; namely, that the Mitzrites—of whose Sovereign the Patriarch Joseph was the Minister, under whom the Israelites were in bondage, and from whose hands they were liberated by their inspired leader and legislator Moses—were not Egyptians, but a people of foreign extraction, of a type quite different from the Egyptians both

ancient and modern, who invaded Egypt from the East, and held rule over its inhabitants during many centuries, and whose descendants exist at the present day in the extreme north-eastern portion of Lower Egypt, at Menzaleh and San—supposed to represent the ancient Tanis and the Zoan of Scripture.

As is stated in a pamphlet "A Few Words with Bishop Colenso on the Subject of the Exodus of the Israelites and the Position of Mount Sinai," published towards the close of 1862, when I was in Egypt in the beginning of that year (January 27th), my attention was directed to the subject of these people by Dr. Schnepf, Secretary of the Egyptian Institute at Alexandria, who also referred me to an article by M. Mariette in the "*Revue Archéologique*" for February 1861, giving an account of them, and describing some ancient statues of the same race dug up by him in that locality.¹

I was then on my way back from Harran with

¹ See "A Few Words with Bishop Colenso," p. 13.

These statues are figured in the "*Revue Archéologique*." A brief notice of them is given in the "*Parthenon*" of June 28, 1862. Some of the physical distinctions between the Mitrites and the Egyptians were indicated by me in a paper "On the Complexion of the Ancient Egyptians," published in the "*Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature*," vol. iii. pp. 143-152, and reprinted in the "*Philosophical Magazine*," vol. xi. (1837), pp. 344-353.

my wife, having for many years previously, as is related in my pamphlet "Mount Sinai a Volcano," paid no attention whatever to the object of the studies of my youth. But the instant Dr. Schnepf brought these interesting facts to my knowledge, I at once perceived and explained to him that these stranger people must be the representatives of the ancient *Mitzrites*, of whose existence as a nation distinct from the Egyptians, into whom they subsequently merged, and so became lost as a separate people, a memorial, independently of the Hebrew Scriptures, has been preserved in the legendary history of the *Hyksos* or Shepherd Kings.

The account given by Herodotus of the cruelty of the builders of the Pyramids of Ghizah, Cheops, and Chephren has been imagined to allude to these Hyksos. He says, "Thus the affliction of Egypt endured for the space of one hundred and six years, during the whole of which time the temples were shut up and never opened. The Egyptians so detest the memory of these kings that they do not much like even to mention their names. Hence they commonly call the Pyramids after Philiton, a shepherd who at that time fed his flocks about the place."¹

In a note on this passage my old friend, Sir

¹ Herodotus, lib. ii. c. 128, Rawlinson's Trans.

Gardner Wilkinson,¹ remarks, that "this can have no connection with the invasion or the memory of the Shepherd Kings, at least as founders of the Pyramids, which some have conjectured; for these monuments were raised long before the rule of the Shepherd Kings in Egypt;" and Professor Rawlinson goes on to say,² "In the mind of the Egyptians two periods of oppression may have gradually come to be confounded, and they may have ascribed to the tyranny of the Shepherd Kings what in reality belonged to a far earlier time of misrule. It should not be forgotten that the Shepherds, whether Philistines, Hittites, or other Scyths, would at any rate . . . be regarded by the Egyptians as Philistines. Hence, perhaps, the name of Pelusium (Philistine-town), applied to the last city which *they* held in Egypt."

The builders of the Pyramids are considered to have been monarchs of Manetho's fourth native dynasty. But, as Professor Owen stated at the anniversary dinner of the Royal Geographical Society, on May 24, 1869, "Ethnologically we learn from sculptures and figures of the second, third, and fourth dynasties, exhumed by Mariette,

¹ This learned Egyptologist's decease has occurred since the above was written.

² Rawlinson's Herodotus, vol. ii. p. 205 note.

that the founders of such governed society in the fertile soil of Egypt were certainly not African, not Ethiopian, but Asiatic, with indications of a more northern origin than the Assyrian or the Hindoo;"¹ that is to say, the builders of the Pyramids were not native Egyptians, but an exotic race, of "a more northern origin than the Assyrian or Hindoo," who invaded and occupied Lower Egypt long before the time of the Hyksos or Shepherd Kings.

But in a paper on the Ethnology of Egypt, read at a meeting of the Anthropological Institute on June the 9th last,² by the same scholar since his return from Egypt, it was asserted that the study of the portrait sculptures discovered by Mariette Bey "led to the conclusion that three distinct types were indicated: first, the Primal Egyptian type, with no trace either of Negro or Arab; secondly, the type of the conquering Shepherd Kings or Syro-Arabians, which is exemplified in the Abyssinian sculptures; thirdly, the Nubian Egyptian." This statement I cannot reconcile with the same scholar's exposition made five years previously, unless it be that the "Primal Egyptians" were an "Asiatic" people, with indications of a more northern origin

¹ See Beke's "Idol in Horeb," p. 41.

² Proceedings of the Anthropological Society, June 9, 1874.

than the "Assyrian or the Hindoo." Doubtless when the paper itself is printed *in extenso* the matter will be rendered more intelligible than it is at present.

Reverting to the history of the Hyksos or Shepherd Kings, it has to be remarked that these invaders of Egypt were by Josephus imagined to be the children of Israel,¹ and the history of their expulsion from Egypt to be only another version of that of the Exodus. Nothing can, however, be more erroneous than such a supposition; and when the text of the Scripture narrative is properly translated and understood, it will be manifest that the history of the sojourn of the children of Israel in Mitzraim and among the Mitzrites is applicable to a different country and a different people.

It has already been shown² that the Mitzraim of Scripture, the country into which the Patriarch Abram went down, and after him his grandson Jacob and his sons, may far more reasonably be assumed to have been a region adjoining the Negeb or South Country and the land of the Philistines than the more distant Egypt watered by the river Nile. That the inhabitants of that country, the

¹ Contra Apion, lib. i. cap. 26.

² Chap. ii. pp. 49-51 of this work.

Mitzrites, were not Egyptians, may be shown by the following considerations.

The invasion of the Hyksos or Shepherds, whose remains have also been exhumed by M. Mariette, was described by Professor Owen, on the occasion just referred to, as having "introduced into Egypt the Arabian blood."—He now calls them Syro-Arabians,—and it is to them that Egypt was indebted for the horse, as a beast of draught, inasmuch as previously to this Philistine or Arabian invasion the manifold frescoes on the tombs of Egyptian worthies show no other soliped than the ass. The dromedary, he added, was a still later introduction.

But we find numerous passages in the Hebrew Scriptures wherein mention is made of the horse in connection with the former country,¹ and we also learn therefrom that Mitzraim was from the earliest ages famous for its horses;² whilst at a later date Solomon had those animals brought from thence;³ and in the reign of his successor, Shishak, King of Mitzraim, came up against Jerusalem "with twelve hundred chariots and threescore thousand horsemen;"⁴ and as regards the dromedary ("camel"),

¹ See Gen. l. 9; Exod. xiv. 6-9, &c.

² See Deut. xvii. 16.

³ 1 Kings x. 28, 29.

⁴ 2 Chron. xii 3.

this animal was perfectly well known in Mitzraim from the time of Abraham and Jacob.¹

Had these animals been known in Egypt at that early period, they could not have failed to be depicted by the Egyptians in their hieroglyphs and frescoes, on which are represented every living creature with which those people were acquainted. It is therefore the veriest truism to affirm that Mitzraim, the country which possessed horses and dromedaries from the time of the Patriarchs, cannot possibly be the same country as Egypt, wherein those animals were unknown till a much later period.

We have now to read the Hebrew Scriptures upon the assumption that the inhabitants of Mitzraim, the country into which "Joseph was carried by the Midianites, were Hyksos or Shepherds, and not the Egyptians, as is usually imagined.² In the first place, we read³ that Joseph was brought down to Mitzraim, and Potiphar, an officer of Pharaoh, captain of the guard, a Mitzrite, bought him of the hands of the Ishmeelites, which had brought him

¹ Gen. xii. 16, xxxvii. 25. This argument respecting the early existence of the horse and dromedary in Mitzraim, and their non-existence in Egypt, was employed by me in "*Origines Biblicæ*," pp. 200, 273, and "*Vertheidigung gegen Dr. Paulus*" (Leipz. 1836), p. 48.

² Mitzraim and Philistim, Manetho, *Φοίνικες* !!

³ Gen. xxxix. 1.

down thither." On this text the objection has been raised by Professor Lepsius that ¹ "here, as in all other passages where the 'Egyptian' King is mentioned, he is called Pharaoh:" and he adds, that, "This is an Egyptian designation, and not a Semitic one, as we should have expected if the Semitic Hyksos had still ruled in 'Egypt.' In that case we should have been everywhere compelled to admit, in this designation, throughout the history of Abraham, Jacob, Joseph, and Moses, an anachronism which cannot easily find a parallel." Yet nothing is easier than to find such a seeming anachronism right before our eyes at the present day.

Shortly before the commencement of the Christian era the Celtic country of Gallia or Gaul was invaded, overrun, subjugated, and colonised by the Romans, from whom it received its institutions, its language, and pagan religion. Nearly five centuries after its conquest by Julius Cæsar, Gallia was invaded by the German tribe of Franks under Pharamond, who took the place of the Romans, so that the Greek historian Procopius, writing in A.D. 550, could say of them,² "the Franks are on

¹ See Professor Lepsius's "Letters from Egypt, Ethiopia, and Mount Sinai," p. 476.

² *De Bello Vandalico*, i. 3.

the frontiers of Italy ; they were formerly called Germans,"—who founded a monarchy, which, under various changes and several dynasties, may be said to have subsisted down to this day. But all these dynasties have been not of Gallic, but of German extraction ; whether the Merovingians, under whose rule Pagan Gaul became Christian France, the Carolingians, who raised France to the highest rank in Western Christendom, or the Capetians, descendants of Count Robert the Strong, the Maccabæus of the West Frankish realm, the patriarch of the old Capets, of the Valois, and of the Bourbons.¹ And so completely and incessantly do the descendants of the Frankish invaders of Gaul bear testimony to their German origin, that nineteen French sovereigns have been named Louis, ten Charles, four Henry, and two Robert, all which honoured names, as is patent, are corrupted forms of the hated "barbarian" German designations Ludwig, Carl, Heinrich, and Rothbart. And it is a curious fact that at the present day the three aspirants to the throne of France all bear German names—Henri (Heinrich), Comte de Chambord ; Robert (Rothbart), Comte de Paris ; and Louis (Ludwig) Napoleon. The origin of Robert the

¹ See Freeman's Historical Essays, p. 222.

Strong is discussed by M. Mourin, and more fully by Dr. Kalkstein in his first *Excursus*. He was the son of the Saxon Wittikind, and the father of Odo, Count of Paris, whose son was Hugh Capet. Mr. Freeman tersely says, "The Count of Paris was merged in the Duke of the French, and the Duke of the French was soon merged in the King."

This, then, is sufficient answer to the argument that, whatever may be our belief on other grounds,¹ it would be *impossible* to combine with it the circumstance that Joseph received from Pharaoh an "Egyptian" name. The like may be said with respect to the other "Egyptian" proper names occurring in the Hebrew Scriptures, such as "Pharaoh," "Rameses," "Pithom," "Asemeth," "Potiphorah," as having been used in Mitzraim.

Dr. Lepsius next objects, that when the sons of Jacob spoke among themselves in the presence of Joseph of their conduct towards him, they spoke out loud in his presence; and that "they knew not that Joseph understood them; for he spake unto them by an interpreter."² And hence he argues that "Joseph had become so completely an Egyptian, and the Egyptian language was so exclusively spoken at the court of Pharaoh, that the brethren

¹ Lepsius's Letters, p. 478.

² Gen. xlii. 23.

could not conjecture any one was near them who understood their language.”¹ But, as it is replied in my “*Origines Biblicæ*,” in answer to the same objection on the part of other commentators ;² “the fact appears to have been overlooked, that although Joseph’s brethren knew not that he understood or overheard them, because the *melîtz* (the interpreter or officer) was between them, yet as there is nothing in the Scriptural statement to lead to the supposition that they spoke entirely apart from Joseph and the *melîtz*, the latter individual it is evident must have both overheard and understood them, and they must consequently have been fully aware that by his report Joseph might be made acquainted with what they said, just in the same way as if he himself overheard them. Is not the following, however, the proper explanation of the transaction? Joseph, having resided in Mitzraim above twenty years, and having become a naturalised Mitzrite, may not have been known to foreigners otherwise than in the character of a native, and he may indeed have been desirous, as a matter of policy, that his foreign extraction should be concealed. Hence in his communications with his brethren, who came before him as natives of the adjoining

¹ Lepsius’s Letters, p. 479.

² *Origines Biblicæ*, pp 247, 248.

country of the Philistines, he may have thought fit to employ an interpreter to translate their rustic dialect of the south country into the more polished language of Mitzraim Proper;—for we may well imagine that, notwithstanding the common origin and closely intimate connection of the two tongues, they may each, when spoken, have been as unintelligible to the natives of the other country, as we find instanced in so many of the cognate dialects of Modern Europe. But whilst the brothers thus spoke to Joseph through the interpreter in the language of the south country, they may also have conversed among themselves in the Aramitish tongue of the country in which they had been born; and as they may have had reason to know that the interpreter was not acquainted with that language, so neither could they have had the slightest ground for imagining that Joseph, whom they looked upon as a native Mitzrite, would understand them,—since even for the purpose of communicating with them in their adopted language of the south country he seemed to require an interpreter.” Another objection is, that when, on their second visit to Joseph’s house, his brethren were about to take their meal, it is said, “And they set on for him by himself, and for them by themselves, and

for the 'Egyptians' which did eat with him, by themselves: because the 'Egyptians' might not eat bread with the Hebrews; for that is an abomination unto the 'Egyptians.'"¹ On which the learned Professor remarks, that "the native Egyptians could never have expressed this horror and regulated their manners accordingly, under the dominion of a Semetic reigning family"—that is to say, during the sovereignty of the Hyksos or Shepherd Kings. And he further objects that "it is equally improbable that Joseph would have advised the immigrating family to call themselves shepherds in order to obtain from Pharaoh a country set apart for themselves. 'And it shall come to pass, when Pharaoh shall call you, and shall say, What is your occupation? That ye shall say, Thy servants' trade hath been about cattle from our youth even until now, both we and also our fathers: that ye may dwell in the land of Goshen; for every shepherd is an abomination unto the "Egyptians."'"² If the Shepherd people of the Hyksos reigned in Egypt, how could the shepherds have been an abomination to them?"³

This is precisely the question I myself asked long

¹ Gen. xliii. 32.

² Gen. xlvi. 33, 34.

³ Lepsius's Letters, p. 479.

ago ; and have myself answered on more than one occasion, by showing that the word “abomination” used in this and in other passages in the Pentateuch, and elsewhere, is a mistranslation of the Hebrew word תועבה (*to’ebah*).

The word in question is derived from the root תעב [*ta’ab*], of which Gesenius says in his Lexicon (edit. Robinson, 1855), ‘the primary idea seems to be *to thrust forth* or *away*, *to drive away*, and hence *to reject*, *to abhor*, *to abominate* ;’ comparing it, however, with תאב [*taab*], to which he gives the double meaning of ‘*to desire*, *to long after*,’ and ‘*to abominate*, *to abhor*.’

But I conceive that the two roots are, in fact, identical—the guttural *y* in the one being softened into *n* in the other—and that their primary meaning is not *to thrust forth* or *away* in a bad sense alone, but indefinitely *to put away* or *aside*, *to set apart*, *to separate*, either in a good or in a bad sense, and hence *to dedicate* or *consecrate*, and this too either for a good or for a bad purpose, as is so remarkably the case with the root קדש [*kadash*].

The Græek ἀνάθεμα, the Latin *sacer*, the French *sacré*, and even the English *sacred* and *devoted*, have all this double meaning and application.

These last two words are thus used together in a bad sense by Milton :

‘But to destruction sacred and devote.’

Paradise Lost, iii. 208.

Consequently the primary meaning of the Hebrew noun-substantive *to'ebah* is a ‘person or thing set apart,’ belonging to a distinct class, and thus appropriated or dedicated to some special purpose, religious or otherwise; and when the expression came to acquire a more definite meaning, either in a good or a bad sense, the context was in each case sufficient to determine in which of those senses it was employed. The *taboo* of the South-Sea Islanders offers an exact parallel. It is *taboo* for the two sexes to eat together, just as it was *to'ebah* for the Mitzrites to eat with strangers (Gen. xliii. 32); and in like manner many persons, animals, and things are *taboo*,¹ as shepherds and goatherds, and their flocks were *to'ebah*. The resemblance of the two words *to'ebah* and *taboo*, I look on, however, as purely accidental. There is no sufficient reason to suppose the one to be derived from the other.

The following note is made in Gesenius's Lexicon on the word אֵבָה, the meaning of which is to

¹ See note on Exodus xliii. 2, Bagster's Compr. Bible, and see the Greek ἀγιάζω.

be willing, inclined, to desire:—‘In Arabic this verb has the sense *to be unwilling, to refuse, to loathe*, corresponding to the Hebrew *לֹא אָבָה*. But this must not be regarded as a contrary signification; since the idea of *inclining*, which in Hebrew implies *towards* any one, expressing good-will, in German *Zuneigung*, is in Arabic merely referred to the opposite direction, *i.e.*, *from* or *against* any one, expressing ill-will, in German *Abneigung*, *i.e.*, aversion, loathing.’

When, therefore, Joseph told his brethren to say to Pharaoh, ‘Thy servants’ trade hath been about cattle,’ he did so not because every shepherd was “an abomination” unto the Mitzrites, which would have been an absurdity, but because among these people the shepherds formed a respected *separate* class—were *taboo*—were ‘high caste,’ as the Brahmins are in India.

In fact, there ought not to be any doubt as to the signification of the word. If the narrative of Joseph’s presentation of his father and brethren to the King of Mitzraim be only regarded from a plain, common-sense point of view, independently of its traditional interpretation, it must convince even the most sceptical that the expression in question has been wrongly translated.

The Hebrew slave Joseph, who has become the favourite Minister and Viceroy of the King of Mitzraim, causes his father and brethren to join him in the country of his adoption. Before introducing them to his sovereign, he tells them that he shall represent them to him as shepherds; and he desires them, when questioned, to confirm his statement. The reason he gives for this is, that among the Mitzrites 'every shepherd is *to'ebah*.' I know not how to translate this expression into English so as to retain the double meaning of the original; but it may be rendered in Latin *omnis pastor est sacer*, and in French *tout pasteur est sacré*. Joseph's family do as they are directed. The King receives them most graciously, and says to his Minister: 'Thy father and thy brethren are come unto thee. The land of Mitzraim is before thee. In the best of the land make thy father and brethren to dwell; in the land of Goshen let them dwell. And if thou knowest any men of activity among them, then make them rulers over my cattle.'¹

Now if the word *to'ebah* meant 'an abomination,' in like manner as the Latin *sacer* and the French *sacré* might be understood, to mean 'accursed,' and if the fact were that the Mitzrites

¹ Gen. xlvii. 5, 6.

'held shepherds in the utmost contempt' (which, however, is merely an assumption consequent on the received translation), is it consistent, is it at all probable, is it indeed possible, morally speaking, that Joseph should so expressly, and seemingly so unnecessarily, have desired his father and brethren to volunteer the avowal that they belonged to that despised and detested class? And would the King have treated the nearest relatives of his favourite Minister in so contemptuous, so abominable a manner, and so disgraced that Minister himself, as to employ them in such a degraded occupation?

But if the expression in question has the meaning for which I contend, in like manner as the Latin *sacer* and the French *sacré* may mean 'sacred,'—if shepherds were a respected, separate, even if not sacred, class among the Mitzrites, were freemen, gentlemen, or nobles, according to our modern ideas, then the whole transaction becomes natural, consistent, and intelligible. Joseph designedly represented the occupation of his family to be such as would qualify them for admission into a select and superior class among the natives of the country, and the Monarch on his Minister's representation unhesitatingly recognised their right

of admission; and, further, in order to manifest his esteem for them, and to do them and his favourite himself the greater honour, he at once appointed some of them to have the charge of his own cattle, not as mere herdsmen, but in some such capacity as we may imagine to be equivalent to rangers of the royal parks and forests with us.

Accepting this as being the meaning of the word *to'ebah*, and as establishing the fact that in the time of Joseph shepherds formed a select and superior class in charge of the 'sacred' animals of the Mitzrites, we may understand how, at the subsequent period of the Exodus, when Pharaoh ordered the Israelites to sacrifice "in the land," Moses said,¹ "It is not meet so to do; for we shall sacrifice the sacred animal [*l'animal sacré*, not *le sacré animal*] of the Mitzrites to Jehovah our God: lo, shall we sacrifice the sacred animal of the Mitzrites before their eyes, and will they not stone us?" The meaning of which indisputably is, that the animal which the Israelitish leader purposed sacrificing—namely, a "lamb, . . . a male of the first year, . . . taken out from the sheep or from the goats,"²—was an object of special care and regard, even if not of worship, among the Mitzrites, under

¹ Exod. viii. 25, 26.

² Exod. xii. 3-5.

the charge of a separate class of men; sheep and goats being *taboo*, like their keepers.

That at that early period these 'sacred' animals were actually adored or worshipped by the Mitzrites may, however, be doubted. There is nothing in the Scripture history to warrant such an assumption, or even the belief that the Mitzrites were worshippers of animals or idolaters, *like* the ancient Egyptians.¹ [In a paper on the "Prometheus" of Æschylus, printed in the "Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature," vol. ii. (xviii.) p. 385, Sir E. Coleridge unqualifiedly expresses the same opinion.] And therefore all that we are justified in concluding, and it is sufficient for the present purpose, is, that among the Mitzrites, Hyksos, or Shepherd Kings, shepherds and their flocks were, as is most natural, objects of regard and reverence,² and not 'an abomination,' as the word *to'ebah* has been so erroneously supposed to mean.

The statement recently made by Mr. Petherick, formerly British Consul at Khartum, respecting the regard in which the Dinkas tribes on the Upper Nile hold their cattle, is illustrative of what I conceive the custom of the Mitzrites to have been.

¹ See *Origines Biblicæ*, p. 305.

² In the "Times" of the 25th inst. it is asserted that the volcano of Tongariro is regarded by the Maoris as *tapu*, or "sacred."

Colonel Grant having attributed the superior physique of the Dinkas to that of the Shillûks to the fact of their "fattening themselves on their herds," Mr. Petherick replied, that though both tribes possess enormous herds of cattle, it is well known that "neither tribe will kill one of their herd for consumption. They will eat them after death from accident or natural causes, but will not kill them for food, no matter to what extremities they may be put for want of nutriment." And as an instance of this, Mr. Petherick relates that while travelling through the *Awan*, a sub-Dinka tribe, he had bought a bullock, and having unwittingly ordered it to be slaughtered before the Chief and his followers had quitted his temporary camp, he stood in imminent danger of an attack from the tribe for having insulted and degraded them by slaying the animal in their presence.¹ Here there does not appear to be any idea among the Dinkas of worshipping the animals, the bodies of which they do not scruple to eat after death from accident or natural causes; neither can they regard their lives as sacred, inasmuch as they sold one to Mr. Petherick; but on his unwittingly happening to slaughter the animal in their presence he exposed himself to a similar danger to that which

¹ The Times, July 15, 1874.

Moses knew he and the Israelites would run were they to sacrifice—that is to say, slaughter for eating—the *to'ebah* of the Mitzrites before their eyes.

Though the Jews of later ages appear to have generally understood the expression in question in a bad sense, in which they have been followed by all Christian translators in deference to the Septuagint Greek version, it is manifest, nevertheless, from the Targum of Onkelos, that such was not the unanimous acceptance of the term even down to so late a period as the commencement of the Christian era; for the two texts above cited are thus rendered by that most learned Rabbi, as is shown in Mr. Etheridge's English translation, *The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan*, &c.: 'because the Mizraee *keep at a distance* all shepherds of flocks,' which is, almost precisely the primary meaning I attach to the root *ta'ab*; and 'because *the animals which the Mizraee worship* we shall take to sacrifice,' which is the secondary meaning, in a good sense, for which I likewise contend.

It is proper to explain that this highly important error in the Greek and other versions first presented itself to me on October 8th, 1833, as appears from an entry in my notebook under that date. In my work "*Origines Biblicæ*," published in the following

year, I merely alluded to the subject in a note in page 241, intending to discuss it in a second volume ; but the reception my work met with was such that I had no inducement to continue it. Nevertheless, two years afterwards, when answering an adverse critique in the *Heidelberger Jahrbücher*, from the pen of the late Dr. Paulus of Jena (*Vertheidigung*, &c., pp. 45-47), I entered into the subject at some length.

At that time, and indeed until quite recently, I did not know my interpretation of the word *to'ebah* to be almost identical with that of Onkelos, or I should gladly have cited this venerable authority in support of my argument for the radical distinction between the Mitzrites, Hyksos, or Shepherds, among whom the Israelites were in bondage, and the Egyptians of profane history, which distinction M. Mariette's discovery of the remains of the former people has now demonstrated to be a fact.

Twelve centuries after the date of the important event in the history of the progenitors of the Israelitish nation on which I have thus dwelt, the Father of profane history speaks of the Mendesians, who, occupying a portion of Lower Egypt in the direction of ancient Mitzraim, may not improbably have derived some of their usages

from the natives of that country ; and he relates that they¹ ‘pay reverence to all goats, and more to the males than to the females,’ adding, quite consistently, that ‘*the goat-herds* who tend them *receive greater honour.*’ At that time, however, by the ordinary process of development, the religion of the Mendesians had become so debased and brutalized, that the he-goat, in the character of the god Pan, was the direct object of divine worship, or, to use the erroneous expression of the Septuagint translators, was their ‘abomination.’

From what has thus been said, it will be seen how little ground there is for Professor Lepsius’s conclusion from the same premises.—“It is therefore evident that Joseph lived at an Egyptian, and not a Semitic [Mitzritish] court ; the old tradition of the Jewish interpreters, that Joseph came to ‘Egypt’ in the reign of a Shepherd King, Apophis, is entirely destroyed, as well as the view taken by more modern scholars concerning the Hebrew chronology of that time.”² The evidence from every quarter really is that Joseph came into Mitzraim during the reign of a Shepherd King, and that he lived at a Mitzritish court. As to the proper

¹ Herodotus, ii. 46.

² Lepsius’s *Letters*, pp. 479, 480.

name of the Pharaoh at whose court he lived, we require far more trustworthy testimony than we at present possess, to warrant us in believing it to have been Apophis, or any other name of the Manethonic lists.

The further question as to the Pharaoh in whose reign the Exodus of the Israelites actually took place is attended with still greater difficulties. The supposition is that the "new king over Mitzraim who knew not Joseph,"¹ in whose reign Moses was born, was of a different race from the Pharaoh whose Minister Joseph had been—was no longer a Shepherd King, is untenable, for the reason that the *tó'ebah*, or the sacred animal of the people under whom the Israelites were in bondage, was the same as it had been when Joseph's brethren were set apart by Pharaoh to be the "rulers over (his) cattle."²

Josephus attributes this notion to Manetho, and gives some most distorted accounts of the Exodus, which he professes to repeat in the very words of the Egyptian scribe. Even if confidence might be placed in the report of the Jewish historian, which, seeing the manner in which he himself manipulates the history, is exceedingly questionable, there are

¹ Exod. i. 8.

² Gen. xlvii. 6.

points bearing on the subject which are highly deserving of consideration.

The first is the facility with which the transfer of the name of Mitzraim to Egypt may have taken place, so that the traditions of the one country may, together with its name, have passed into and become incorporated with the national history of the other. We have an instance of this in the Eastern or Greek Empire, which acquired the denomination of the Western or Roman Empire; the language of modern Greece being called, not 'Hellenic,' but 'Romaic;' and 'Roman' (*Ρωμαῖος*), not 'Greek,' being the name by which, previously to the separate existence of the kingdom of the Hellenes, a Christian Greek distinguished himself from the Mohammedan inhabitants of his country.

This confusion of names has led to a singular, and it may be most important result in Abyssinia. It is an historical fact, that in the fourth century that country received its first Christian missionaries from 'Rome,' that is to say, from the Greek Church of Constantinople, or *New Rome*. At the present day the Roman Catholic missionaries in that country represent themselves, truly enough, as coming from 'Rome,'—only in this case the name means

Old Rome; and as the Abyssinians have no very extensive geographical or historical knowledge, and as the Romish priests, more politic than their predecessors in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, modify their ritual, and cloak if they do not actually modify their dogmas, so as not to offend native prejudices, they are making steady progress in the diffusion of their faith, which the ignorant Abyssinians are thus led to imagine to be that of the Fathers of their Church; just in the same way as the Jews of Alexandria imagined their forefathers to have been in bondage in Egypt.

And in the second place, the traditions and histories of the two countries having got mixed up together, we may perfectly understand that the scribes of Egypt might be disposed to give a favourable colour to events in the history of Mitzraim as if they belonged to their own national history. In what form they would have been likely to do this may be instanced by the native Burmese account of the British invasion and conquest of that country.

Ritter in his "Erdkunde von Asien," Bd. 4, s. 270, 271, 2te Ausgabe, says, when speaking of the Burmese von oben lien, that the *Political Lie* is authoritatively sanctioned among them. In the court

chronicle, the historiographer gives the following account of the last English war :—" In the years 1186 and 1187 (A.D. 1824 and 1825), the *Kulapyu* (i.e., the white strangers) from the west made war against the Master and Lord of the Golden House. They landed at Rangoon, which place they took as well as Prome. Owing to his clemency and goodness, the king desired to spare human life, and therefore did not oppose them, so that the strangers were allowed to advance as far as Yandabu. They had, however, invested large sums of money in this expedition; and when they reached Yandabu they found themselves in want and in great distress. They therefore implored the King to help them, and he, in his mercy generously sent them large sums of money to enable them to pay their debts, and he then commanded them to leave the country." On this Ritter remarks: "Such is their historical truthfulness, and from it we may judge the little value of their chronicles." But on the other hand, it has to be observed that the actual historical facts are stated: the landing of the British, their taking of Rangoon, their advance as far as Yandabu; the payment to them of large sums of money, and their consequent departure from the country. It is the motives for their conduct that are falsely stated,

whereby a totally untrue colour is given to the occurrences recorded.

But, after all, there is nothing extraordinary in this. How seldom, even in Europe, is history written more accurately than we here see it written in Burmah. Too often, indeed, do we find the facts not merely misrepresented and distorted, but absolutely falsified, as, for instance, in the war bulletins of the first Napoleon, and as in the rival reports of the opposing parties in the Spanish Carlist war of 1874, from which it is often impossible to decide on which side the advantage really is.

I can only say that, under all the circumstances, it is fervently to be desired that some able Egyptologist, possessing a full and intimate acquaintance with all the facts, will be bold enough to emancipate himself from the Manethonic trammels, and from the preconceived ideas which they have only served to render inveterate, and with the greater light we now possess, will *impartially attempt to reconstruct* the chronology and history of Ancient Egypt, and with it those of *Ancient Mitzraim*, as far as may be practicable upon a surer, more consistent, and more intelligible basis. I saw it announced¹ that Dr. Samuel Birch of the British

¹ Athenæum, June 20, 1874.

Museum is writing a small popular History of Egypt for the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. It has to be seen how far this will meet the case.¹

For myself, I have here to do with that ancient history so far only as it is connected with the Exodus of the Israelites; and with respect to these points I think it may be taken to be sufficiently well established that the people among whom the Israelites were in bondage were the Mitzrites, Hyksos, and Shepherd Kings; and further, that the new king over Mitzraim who knew not Joseph was of the same race as the Pharaoh whose Minister that Patriarch had been; the country of those Mitzrites being situated to the east of Egypt Proper, and lying, as was suited to the habits of a shepherd people, beyond the limits of the periodical inundations of the river Nile.

These are postulates which must be accepted as the basis on which the general history of the Exodus is to be reconstructed before we can hope to determine the particulars of that history in any manner at all satisfactory.

¹ This has since been published under the title of "Ancient History from the Monuments of Egypt, from the Earliest Times to B.C. 300," 1875.

CHAPTER IV.

NARRATIVE OF DR. BEKE'S EXPEDITION TO DISCOVER "THE TRUE
MOUNT SINAI," FROM HIS LETTERS TO HIS WIFE.

WHEN I had finally decided on setting out on my journey to the spot where I had calculated on finding Mount Sinai, in accordance with the views enunciated in my pamphlet "Mount Sinai a Volcano," written whilst I was resident at Nice during the preceding winter, and published shortly after my return to England in June 1873, it became necessary that, not being a geologist myself, I should find some qualified person to accompany me in that capacity. The task was not altogether an easy one. In the first instance, I addressed myself to Professor Ramsay, the able Director of the Geological Survey of England, who was so good as to interest himself on my behalf, in the hope of being able to find some student of the School of Mines, who might be willing to accompany me on the terms I proposed, namely, that I should defray all his travelling and hotel expenses from the time

we left England till our return ; but without otherwise remunerating him for his services. I also applied to several personal friends ; but all to no beneficial purpose, so that I had almost begun to fear I should not through private channels be able to find any one willing to agree to my terms, and I was thinking of advertising in the public journals, when, at the evening meeting of the Royal Geographical Society, on November 3, 1873, I met Professor Tennant, who asked me a question respecting a certain diamond about which there was formerly a scientific discussion at the British Association, but this subject I need not dwell on here. In the course of our conversation I mentioned to him that I was in search of a young geologist to accompany me on my journey to Mount Sinai, whereupon he at once said, that if the young friend who was standing by his side should feel inclined to go with me, he was the very man. This young friend was Mr. John Milne, whom he introduced to me as having only two days ago returned from Newfoundland, having previously been in Iceland. Of course there was no opportunity for saying much on the subject, but I stated briefly the scope of my expedition, and gave Mr. Milne a copy of my pamphlet [*'Mount Sinai a Volcano'*], which I had by me,

and it was settled that if he should be disposed to accompany me, he was to write to me. Meanwhile, I ascertained from Mr. Tennant that his young friend was in every respect likely to suit me. He was for some time a pupil of his, and was a very fair mineralogist; he had been a student of the School of Mines, of which he held a scholarship for this year and the next; he was a tolerable draughtsman, and was generally well informed; in fact, he spoke in the highest terms of him. On the following Thursday Mr. Milne wrote to me asking for further information relative to my projected trip, and this led to a meeting on the following Monday. As our negotiations did not progress very rapidly, and as his private affairs seemed likely to detain him in England longer than would suit my convenience, I proposed that I should start alone for Egypt, where I should necessarily be detained some time making arrangements for the further journey, and that he could join me there later on.

Meanwhile my wife and I had agreed that she should pass the winter at Hastings, as she was in too weak health to accompany me as usual on my travels; and I purposed taking her thither to see her settled before I left England, and therefore pro-

posed not to return to London, but to start from Hastings direct for the Continent.

This led to a final arrangement. Mr. Milne expressed his readiness to accompany me, and to start at once, on my agreeing to defray all his expenses out and home, and upon the understanding that his absence from England should not exceed three months. During the few days that we should yet remain in England, he was to attend at the house of the Royal Geographical Society in Savile Row, to learn from Captain George, R.N. (curator of the map room),¹ the use of his travelling mountain barometer, and other instruments, which the Council of the Society kindly lent me for use on my expedition.

Having thus completed my arrangements, I went with my wife, on December 2, 1873, down to Hastings, where I saw her housed for the winter, and on the morning of the 8th I left Hastings for Folkestone, where I had appointed Mr. Milne to meet me. On the way I travelled with a Colonel Gibbon, R.E., with whom I had some interesting talk about Colonel Gordon, who had been engaged by the Khédive to take the place of Sir Samuel Baker in Upper Egypt. Although I do not know Colonel

¹ This very courteous and able officer has since resigned his post at the Royal Geographical Society.

Gordon personally, I should have had no hesitation in introducing myself to him. At the same time it was more *en règle* that I should have a personal introduction to him, and for this purpose Colonel Gibbon kindly gave me his card.

But the continuation of the narrative of my journey will be given from my letters to my wife whilst on this memorable journey.

December 8, 1873.—At Folkestone I met Mr. Milne, who came down from London by the boat-train, and we crossed over to Boulogne together, and proceeded direct to Paris, where we arrived in time for a late dinner. To write about our journey thus far may seem a work of supererogation, and yet it is always a satisfaction to be able say that it was pleasant. To me the condition of the sea is of no great consequence ; but to Mr. Milne, who is a very bad sailor, it was important that the weather, though cold, should have been remarkably fine, with the sea as smooth as glass. On the way to Paris we found it excessively cold, notwithstanding that we had the usual foot-warmers. Having seen but very little of my companion, Mr. Milne, in London, I could not be quite sure how we should get on together, but my first day's journey satisfied me that we should not do amiss, and after the completion of the journey I am happy

to be able to record that I was not disappointed in my anticipation.

Of course our principal topic of conversation was what I hoped to do and find where we were going. My pamphlet Mr. Milne had studied well, but there were still many points on which he was desirous of information, and this I was only too ready and willing to give him, so that our conversation did not flag; and as we were during the whole journey alone in the carriage, we could converse without restraint. In the course of conversation my companion showed me a book, which his friend Mr. Tennant had given him just before starting, namely, a copy of the "Travels" of Irby and Mangles, recently republished in Murray's Library. I knew the work, but had not had occasion to refer to it for very many years. On turning over the leaves, my attention was riveted on a description of three *volcanic peaks* seen by the travellers on their way to Petra, at some distance on their left hand, seemingly on, or near to the Hadj route from Damascus to Mecca. Not having a map to refer to, I could not tell the precise position of these volcanoes; but they would almost seem to correspond to the position which I attributed to the Harra Radjlâ of the Arabian geographer Yakut. If so, my work will soon be done: in fact,

it is done for me beforehand. But without a map I cannot be sure, and there is always the danger of these volcanoes being too far to the north and east to suit the position which I attribute to Mount Sinai. We shall see, Inshallah !

Milne showed me a letter which Mr. Poulett Scrope¹ had written to Mr. Woodward, of the British Museum, on the subject of the "burning bush" (Exod. iii. 2), which I thought might have been a volcanic exhalation—something of the nature of that figured by Professor Wetzstein in his "Reisebericht über Hauran und die Trachonen." Mr. Scrope is much interested in my expedition, and has suggested to me several important subjects of investigation on the spot. My suggestion respecting the "burning bush," has induced him to consult on the subject several of his scientific friends, especially Mr. Woodward. I had suggested the possibility that such appearances might be formed from the deposits from *fumaroles* ; but to this it is objected that they are rather due to the ebullition of the pasty superficial crust giving off gas, and bubbling up, so as to form those pillar-like masses seen on the lava basin of Kilauea, represented in Mr.

¹ I have to record, with regret, the death of this eminent geologist, and generous supporter of Dr. Beke's expedition.

Poulett Scrope's work on 'Volcanos,' p. 476. Mr. Brigham, a missionary in Hawaii, describes the boiling up of the lava, which leaves, on cooling, the most fantastic forms. The fact that Dr. Wetzstein speaks of them as being "like black tongues of flame,"¹ would seem to show that these stick-like bodies are not composed of sulphur; but this cannot be asserted for a certainty in the absence of specimens. Altogether there is plenty of room for speculation.

December 9.—We did no more than sleep at Paris, starting this morning at eleven A.M. by the express train for Turin. Before leaving the capital of France I should have liked Mr. Milne to see something of it, had there been time. As it was, I could only suggest that whilst I went to pay a hurried visit to an acquaintance, he should go and see the Palace of the Tuileries, which, in its ruined state, is to my mind the sight most worth seeing in Paris on account of its associations. I cannot look on it without fancying to myself that I see one of the ruined buildings of Ancient Rome, as it was before the interstices between the columns were walled up, so as to turn it to modern uses.

My companion had no such sentimental fancies. *En vrai géologue*, he came back full of the *fossils*

Wie züngelnde schwarze Flammen," *ut sup.* p. 7.

he had observed in the stones of which the palace is built, which interested him far more than the building itself in its ruined condition. Travelling for five-and-twenty hours consecutively, we arrived the following day at noon at Turin, where we rested for the day, but would not sleep, because I deemed it better to go on the same evening after dinner to Milan, and have five hours more journey before going to bed, and then to rise as much later next morning, so as to catch the train for Venice at 9.20 A.M., instead of having to get up at Turin for the same train leaving that city at 4.40. Travelling in the early morning is much more uncomfortable than late in the evening: the getting up in the cold, and having to pack up, breakfast—and you are lucky if you can get it—and start in the dark, are things above all others to be avoided whenever it is practicable; and it is anything but warm here in the North of Italy in the month of December. I wrote from here to Mr. Bolton to send me out a copy of the best map for my journey.

An amusing episode occurred at Turin with a party of American females—I would not insult our Transatlantic cousins by calling them “ladies”—which, though it caused us some little annoyance at first, was in the result a source of much amusement

to us, and will long continue to be so. Being rather behindhand at the station, we found most of the carriages full, and had some difficulty in finding places. Seeing our position, the guard opened the door of one of the carriages, and desired us to get in. There seemed plenty of room in it, but as Milne and I attempted to get up, we were met by loud cries of "You shan't come in here." Thinking it might be a "ladies' carriage," we were for turning back, but the guard persisted in saying we were to get in; and as we saw there was plenty of room,—there being only three females in a carriage holding eight,—we took our places, though most unwillingly, as one of those, whose fellow-travellers we were thus destined to be, placed herself in the middle of the carriage (where there is a division of the seats), and with her arms akimbo screamed out, "You shan't come here! you shan't come here!" I endeavoured to "tame the shrew" by assuring her that I had no wish to intrude on her and her companions, and I should have much preferred not to travel with them; but she was not to be silenced: especially when, just as the train was going to start, the carriage door was opened and another male passenger was shown in. He was a respectable Piedmontese, apparently of the middle class, who

did not know a word of English, and hearing this torrent of abuse poured out, seemed utterly scared, not knowing at all what it meant. He took his seat in silence by Milne's side, next to the door. I attempted a few words of explanation and apology, but I had hardly opened my mouth when our assailant exclaimed, "You need not speak Italian"—pronounced Eye-talian!—"I understand what you say." Of course it was useless to take any notice of this, or of her continued abuse of us men for our ill manners in intruding our company on *ladies*. Interspersed with this, was her calling through the window to a companion, who had joined a party in another carriage, and who could not be induced to leave them; not even to come to the "lunch" of which her friends with us were about to partake. It sounded strange to our English ears, to hear the repeated cry at night, "Annie! won't you come to your lunch? Annie! why don't you come to your lunch?" And the absurdity of the expression made such an impression on us both, that during the remainder of our journey our usual call to meals was, "Annie! won't you come to your lunch?" We were most happy to part from our American cousins at Alessandria, they going on to Bologna and we to Milan.

After a good night's rest at Milan, we left that city for Venice at 9.20 A.M. I had purposed calling on Mr. Kelly, Her Majesty's Vice-Consul, whose acquaintance, as you know, I had made when we were at Milan towards the end of 1872, and who lives in the Albergo Reale, where we put up for the night. But, as it was too late to call on him, especially as he had arrived from Como only the previous evening, I contented myself with sending my card to his apartment, with "P. P. C., on his way to Mount Sinai." Just before we started, Mr. Kelly came down into the breakfast-room; the omnibus, however, being in the yard, and our luggage loaded on it, we had only time for a few friendly words.

December 11.—We arrived at Venice at 4.15 P.M. My first duty was to despatch a telegram to you announcing my safe arrival thus far; and then Milne and I took our luggage on board the Peninsular and Oriental Company's steamer "Simla," by which vessel I had secured our passage. We have a cabin of four berths to our two selves: it is considerably forward, being even with the fore-hatchway; but this disadvantage is more than counterbalanced by our having it to ourselves; besides, the cabins forward do not feel the motion of the screw. Having deposited our luggage in the cabin, we were not

allowed to remain on board, but had to go on shore for the night. We therefore went to the Hotel Danieli, dined, and after dinner I went out with Milne to show him the 'lions'—those of St. Mark, as well as the others. For myself, I have been at Venice twice before, and I am besides so thoroughly *blasé* as regards mere sight-seeing, that I hardly think I would go ten steps to see the finest sight in the world. Yet I heartily enjoy witnessing the excitement of those to whom such sights are a novelty, and I do not altogether dislike acting as cicerone to young fellow-travellers, provided only that they are intelligent beings, and do not put my patience too much to the test by silly questions and remarks. Milne has never been on the Continent before, except for a day or two at St. Malo, in the time of the last Revolution, and the zest with which he views all the novelties among which he passes, is very refreshing and amusing. But the best of all is that his first thought is the mineralogical character of each object that presents itself to his sight. As in the case of the Tuileries, it is not the form, or age, or historical character of the buildings, so much as the *stone* of which it is built. It is the same with him all the way along; it is not the landscape in which he is interested,

but the character of the *rocks*. He will make me a geologist in time.

At sea, past Ancona, 2 P.M., December 13, 1873.—When we went on board last evening, the steward told us that the steamer would not start till noon. I was therefore in no hurry in the morning, but went out with Milne to show him the Piazza di San Marco. Still, not wishing to be behindhand, I thought it better to be on board soon after ten o'clock; and well it was that I did so, for when we reached the steamer at 10.25 A.M., I found her, to my surprise, on the point of starting. The bill of health was already made out, with the number of passengers on board, &c. ! Our two names had to be added; and as soon as this was done the health officers took their departure, and the vessel started. Another five minutes and we should have been too late. The stupid steward had misled us, and my stupidity was not less in allowing myself to be misled. Fortunately my usual nervous anxiety to be in time served me in good stead; had I waited, as most people do, till nearly the last moment, so as still to have "plenty of time," I should have been too late. However, all's well that ends well.

Thus far we have had a delightful passage, the sea

being as smooth as when you and I went from Trieste in 1861 on our way to Harran. We reached Ancona by midnight, and then took in cargo all night, which was not the best thing for a quiet night's rest. At 9.30 in the morning we left Ancona, and we are now steaming and sailing before the wind at the rate of eleven knots an hour. The "Simla" is our old ship, which has been some fifteen or eighteen years in the Indian seas, and is now put on the Mediterranean service. With the exception of the officers, the ship has an Italian crew, now shipped at Venice. The English crew are on board as passengers to Alexandria, whence they will be sent home to Southampton *via* Gibraltar. They are a lazy, drunken, disobedient, insolent set, and the Peninsular and Oriental Company have wisely decided on having only Italians in their Mediterranean service. I have really nothing to tell you except that I continue quite well, and get on with Milne, who helps me just as a son might his father.

Brindisi, December 14, Sunday.—We arrived at about ten o'clock this morning after a wonderfully smooth passage, and are now busily taking in some 300 tons of coal. We were advised to spend the day on shore on account of the dirt and noise of coaling, and Milne did indeed land as soon as we

arrived, but he did not remain long on shore, being quite disgusted with the place; and no wonder, for it is, as you know, most uninteresting. Knowing the place of old, I remained on board, writing a letter on the "three volcanoes" seen by Irby and Mangles, for insertion in the "Athenæum." I am sorry to say that our commander, Captain Evans, tells me that, on our arrival at Alexandria, we shall have forty-eight hours quarantine. This will be an unfortunate loss of time and money, for we shall have to pay for our keep on board during the two days.

Milne proposes that whilst thus detained on board ship in the harbour, I should give a lecture on my intended journey, both by way of killing time, and also of amusing and instructing our fellow-passengers. He has already spoken to Captain Evans on the subject, who thinks it a good plan, if I have no objection. Of course I have not, as little or no preparation will be necessary, I having merely to read selections from my pamphlet. Milne says that this giving lectures is usual on board American steamers, and that Professor Tyndall gave one going out, and another coming home. I think the plan an excellent one.

And now about Captain Evans. He is your old

friend, the captain of the "Alma," which took you your first voyage from Southampton to Alexandria in 1856! He heard me last night talking about cholera in Mauritius, and so this morning he came and introduced himself to me. I thanked him heartily, as you may suppose, for all his kindness to you on that voyage. It so happens that at table we sit next to the Captain, as our cabins are in the forepart of the vessel, and therefore our seats at the table are not regulated by the position of our berths. Milne, when we came on board at Venice, chose an end seat, in order to provide for his having to run out of the saloon in the event of his feeling *queer*. Our seats turn out to be numbers two and three—the Captain, at the head of the table, being number one. Opposite we have a young man and his wife, apparently newly married, who are going out to India. Next to me is an old Scotchman named Williams, who knew my brother, Colonel William Beek, and his son, Charley, in Sicily. I do not feel at all well to-day, and besides have a nasty hang-nail on the forefinger of the left hand, which has obliged me to get the ship's surgeon to look at it.

At sea, December 15.—We left Brindisi at 6.15 A.M., the weather being even finer and the sea

smoother than it was in the Adriatic. I tell Captain Evans that if you could have known we should have such a passage, you would have been almost tempted to have come with me. I wish you had; only then how should we have managed about the expense? My slight indisposition has passed over, and I am, in fact, all the better for it. A good many passengers came on board at Brindisi, so that we have now sixty-one first-class passengers and a lot of second class. We speak all the languages of the Tower of Babel.

December 16.—The weather is finer than ever. During the night I really thought we were not moving, my cabin being so far forward that in it the motion of the screw and its noise are not felt. Nothing new among the passengers, except that one of them is a Colonel Moggridge, of the Royal Engineers, with whom Milne became acquainted last year on their passage together to America. He came on board at Brindisi, and they have now renewed their acquaintance. He is a brother officer and friend of Colonel Gordon's, and we at first thought he might be going out to join him, but Milne soon learned that he is going right through to India *in quarantine*; that is to say, a special train takes the Indian mails and passengers

across Egypt without communicating with anybody or anything on the road—the train from Alexandria to Suez no longer going through Cairo. On the voyage to Brindisi, and from thence hither, I have been studying the subject of the three volcanic peaks seen by Irby and Mangles, and I have embodied the results of my investigation in an article intended for insertion in the “*Athenæum*.” Milne is a famous preacher of my “gospel;” perhaps I should rather say, an excellent jackal to my lion. He goes about talking with people about me and my expedition in a way I cannot, and could not do; so that by this time the affair is known and talked about by all on board. But I have not fallen in with any one who takes a special interest in it.

December 17.—Still lovely weather, and it is now getting warm. To-morrow morning we shall be at Alexandria, Inshallah! (Please God). In anticipation of our arrival, I have completed the following article for the “*Athenæum*”:¹—

“During my journey from England I have been looking into the ‘*Travels in Egypt*,’ &c., of Captains Irby and Mangles (Murray, 1868), which my companion, Mr. Milne, has happened to bring with him—a work which I may possibly have seen in an earlier

¹ See *Athenæum*, 3d January 1874.

edition in years gone by, but of which I have no recollection—and to my surprise and delight I have lighted on the two passages which are here transcribed. The one is in page 115,¹ describing their departure from Gharundel, between Kerek and Petra, on the east side of the Ghor, the prolongation of the valley of the Jordan south of the Dead Sea, where it is said, ‘Our road was now south-west, and a white line in the desert, at a distance to the left, as far as the eye could reach, was pointed out as the hadj road to Mecca. *We noticed three dark volcanic summits, very distinguishable from the sand. The lava that had streamed from them forms a sort of island in the plain.*’ And in the next page, on their arrival at Showbec or Shobek, they say, ‘We had a most extensive view from here, comprising the whole skirts of the desert, *with the volcanic hills which I have mentioned.*’

“As I have not a map here with me to which I might refer, I cannot comment, except in general terms, on the very important facts brought to my knowledge in the foregoing extracts. But from these it appears that the travellers, when taking a south-west course, saw to their left the road to Mecca, which, of course, bore south-east or there-

¹ Irby and Mangles’ “Travels in Egypt,” London, Murray, 1868.